

AMUSEMENTS.

WOODS' MUSEUM.—The Lydis Thompson Burlesque Troupe, Living and Wild Animals.
WALKERS.—The Lydis Thompson Burlesque Troupe, Living and Wild Animals.
NEW YORK CIRCUS.—The Lydis Thompson Burlesque Troupe, Living and Wild Animals.
THEATRE FRANCAIS.—The Lydis Thompson Burlesque Troupe, Living and Wild Animals.
THEATRE FRANCAIS.—The Lydis Thompson Burlesque Troupe, Living and Wild Animals.
THEATRE FRANCAIS.—The Lydis Thompson Burlesque Troupe, Living and Wild Animals.

The Sun.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1893.

Table with subscription rates for The Sun, including terms for one year, six months, and three months, with prices for different locations.

Workingmen.

No class of men is better able to help themselves than those who labor. They are accustomed to physical activity, their minds are free from the dullness of idleness or dissipation, and whatever they undertake they are quite likely to carry through. They have in general a just conception of the duties of life. Labor is, to a certain extent, an excellent educator, and strengthens the moral as well as the physical part of man; and hence the effort which the laboring classes are making in our own and in foreign countries to prepare themselves for their duties and responsibilities as citizens and as men will not doubt prove successful.

The workingmen in future will probably control the conduct of nations, and in such a case governments must become for more or less a mere puppet of the masses. Until now passion has ruled the world. The vanity of kings and princes, the ambition of nobles, and the selfishness of statesmen have made Europe for ages a scene of anarchy and suffering. National enmities have been fanned, and whole communities have been filled with evil passions by the example of vicious or imbecile sovereigns. Since the period of CHARLES VIII, when the dissolute and repulsive King led his profligate army into Italy, to go no further back, the laboring classes of Europe have never ceased to be the victims of worthless rulers. HENRY VIII. and FRANCIS I. reigned and tormented the people with incessant wars; ELIZABETH, with her legislation, LOUIS XIV. reduced his subjects to actual starvation; the Georges of England, with their insolent delirium; NAPOLEON I. almost completed the ruin of mankind; and NAPOLEON III, by appealing to the fatal military passion of his subjects, has striven to corrupt and demoralize France.

Yet in the face of all these discouragements the workingmen have slowly but surely urged on the progress of nations. They have always been wiser than their rulers. The people have always been far in advance of their governments. They built the great manufacturing cities of the Middle Ages, reclaimed waste lands, founded the commercial centers of the later period, planted colonies, settled America; and one can trace them through all the dreary scenes of modern history, toiling to repair the ravages of war, and slowly regaining the wealth that had been torn from them to satisfy the mad passions of kings and statesmen.

The law has always been their enemy. Workingmen have been constantly oppressed by cruel statutes, and tormented by legal expedients. Justice, which should be as free as air, has been denied to the poor soldier. Even religion, in its corrupt form, has been no friend to labor. Corrupt ecclesiastics have been in the midst of the starving people; rich church establishments have aided in distributing the just returns of honest toil. Literature, less faithful in this particular, from Raleigh to Dickens, has aimed its bitterest satires against the tyrant and the oppressor.

And now, after so many centuries of law and fatal misgovernment, of constant oppression and intolerable suffering, workingmen are making themselves a controlling power in nations. They are beginning to help themselves. They have learned the value of cooperation and union. They are grasping knowledge as the surest means of further progress. They are taking their own colleges and schools, libraries and lectures. They employ their capital for their own benevolence. They are taking the lead in the struggle of ISABELLA from Spain, pursued by the hordes of her people; nor to the struggle of GRACIOSO with DISABOLA, in which the latter, after receiving notice to quit, was summarily ejected. But we allude to sunny fights, big and little, wherein our own countrymen, great and small, have played leading parts.

First among these was the struggle between GEORGE FRANCIS TRAIN and the British Lion. In its early stages the irrepressible Foulton had the advantage; but later, not satisfied with getting our generous friend into one Court, the royal beast got him into four, where he seems likely to stay.

Then followed the fight between Gen. GRANT and ANDY JOHNSON, wherein the former, with a stubbornness that was insupportable, refused to yield an inch of ground.

to supply nature, declined the generous offer of the latter to go to jail in his behalf; he would only break the law and keep STANTON out of the War Office. This affair finally expanded into the famous fight of JOHNSON with Congress, in which, as was alleged at the time, the appliances of Mr. WOOLLEY and the fascinations of Miss REAM proved, with one or two Senators, an overwhelming majority for the logic of WILSON and the rhetoric of BINGHAM.

After this came a series of encounters that may be classified as the BUTLER wars, wherein BUTLER confined WOOLLEY in one of the cells of the Capitol, and expelled Miss REAM from another, and finally wound up in a regular fight, before the people of Essex, with Mr. RICHARD H. DANA, Jr., who seems to have been better suited for drawing an indictment against the late President of the Southern Confederacy than for running for Congress against the modern hero of New Orleans.

And now an interesting chapter of accidents was opened, which, not to put too fine a point upon it, may be called the Bourbon conflict. It commenced with the terrible tussle between BRINSLEY and COURTNEY, when COURTNEY got his finger seriously jammed in the casing of the door, and BRINSLEY was summarily kicked out of the whiskey case. BRINSLEY being out, BLAISDELL and BRINSLEY stepped in and formed a Ring, whereupon FULLERTON and COURTNEY stripped for a fight, which proves to be a good deal more protracted than the COURTNEY-BRINSLEY tussle.

We shall not stop to chronicle such minor matters as the marital contest between Dr. JUDN and his spouse, whose infelicity was a striking illustration of the Shakespearean aphorism that the course of true love never runs smooth; nor the contemplated Indiana prize fight between CONNOR and MCCOON, which resulted in the locking up of both the bruisers; nor the collision between the Metropolitan Police and the widow FERRY, known as "the Washington Woman," wherein that accomplished lady insists that she was involved into these quarters because she was about to publish her correspondence with "certain high officials," whose names, with characteristic delicacy, she withholds from the press, in the hope possibly that these high functionaries will yet come down; nor to the insult which ROTUNDA hurled at BREVINER JOHNSON, and which ended in a fight; nor to the threatened passage at arms between the American Minister and the builder of the Alabamian, which passed off in a ferocious shaking of hands.

But in this catalogue we cannot wholly omit all reference to the contest between GRANT and BELMONT, whose salient point was the October war of the World on FRANK BRADY. Though the World failed in its masterly strategic effort to drive BLAIR off the course, it saw him thoroughly beaten at the end of the race, which must have been highly gratifying to its feelings. Nor do Gov. SEYMOUR, for though the credulous Republicans affect to believe that GRANT is elected, the World, at the close of a series of marvellous mathematical calculations, based on figures which cannot be annulled, announced the result of the Presidential campaign as follows: "Majority for SEYMOUR, 451,357 1/2."

But the grand and brilliant conflicts we have enumerated dwarf their dimensions and pale their fires in the presence of the Great Erie War, now raging on all our borders, and which has enlisted in the ranks of the respective belligerents a large share of the judges, the lawyers, the police officers, the aldermen, the editors, the stockholders, the railway directors, the stockholders, the receivers, and the journalists in the State, and in which SUTHERLAND fights BARNARD, and CARROLL fights SUTHERLAND, and BRADFORD fights CARROLL, and BALCOM, backed by the Attorney-General, fights them all, while the fiery Fisk diversifies the scene by opening his batteries upon the meek members of the Tribune Association.

As we close this record of the memorable conflicts of the current year, it seems doubtful whether the most startling event that will mark the opening of the new year will be a war for metropolitan supremacy between the New York World and the New York Mayor, or the overthrow of LOUIS NAPOLEON by the Red Republicans of Paris.

Relief for City Travel.

The rather rough-tongued but very long-headed DEAN RICHMOND said, a dozen years or more ago, when asked by a brother Director of the Central Railroad if he was not going to use means to carry certain Assembly Districts in view of an anticipated exigency of the corporation, "No it is a 4-cent light cheaper to buy members of the Legislature than to elect them." Since the day this remark of the shrewd financier, politician, and lobbyist was made, the Legislature has sometimes been Democratic and oftentimes Republican; but the stigma he put upon it, whether deserved or undeserved, has adhered to it through whatever changes of politics or membership.

This growing metropolis needs some new mode of transit for passengers from its upper to its lower wards. To obtain this the intervention of the Legislature is necessary. At every session, for many years past, a variety of plans for accomplishing this most desirable object have been before it. Not accepting to their full extent the charges of corruption that have been openly made concerning this subject, it has been apparent to disinterested observers that the Legislature has failed to select and carry through the best plan, or any plan, from the lack either of sufficient intelligence, or independence, or integrity of its members. They have allowed themselves heretofore to be tossed and kicked about between the various competing projects by rival engineers, lawyers, capitalists, and lobbyists, until they have covered themselves with ridicule, suspicion, and contempt.

We trust that our incoming Legislature will take this matter in hand, shelve the shysters off at arm's length, and charter one or two companies which will go to work to relieve this thronging metropolis at the earliest possible date. It is in vain to wait till every last interest is appeased, or every possible improvement adopted. Long ere one mode of transit is completed the city will need three or four, and the best appliances now in use will be thrown into the shade by inventions not yet dreamed of.

Let the Legislature apply its good sense to

the mass of facts stored in its archives, and give us the best act of incorporation it can devise, and it will win the praise of a long-suffering people.

The Tribune comments with force and wisdom upon the deficit of six millions in the revenue of the Post Office Department, and proposes as the means of meeting the difficulty that the franking privilege shall be abolished, not only for members of Congress and Executive officers, but for newspapers as well. We heartily second the motion. There is no good reason for maintaining the present system of giving the journals the free use of the postal system for the transportation of their exchanges. They ought to pay for this service just as much as for any other. In an age of cheap postage like the present, no one should have the right to employ the mails without paying the full cost of the work he requires to be done. We presume that when Congress repeal the right of franking for themselves, they will do it for the newspapers also. They may be sure that the measure will be supported by the press generally, for the journals of the country are not beggars.

The St. Paul Press will not agree with our proposition that Gen. GRANT shall retain his commission as General of the Army while he holds the office of President. "All precedents require," says the Press, "that he should resign his military office before he takes the civic oath." This is an error. Not to go back to earlier days, there is a very prominent precedent of our own times, which shows that there is no such rule as the Press implies. Gen. M. Sherman is not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was not a precedent for this, because his resignation was not required in the regular army. He was not obliged to resign his commission before he took the civic oath, and when he ceased to be Secretary he will go back to duty as a military officer. All that the law and the precedents require is that he shall not exercise the functions or draw the pay of the two offices at once. Certainly there can be no reason why the usage which the case of Gen. Sherman proves to exist should not be applied to the case of Gen. GRANT. Let him not resign his military commission, but hold it as a private citizen. Gen. M. Sherman was